

1 GORDON & SILVER, LTD.
 2 GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.
 3 Nevada Bar No. 229
 4 E-mail: gmg@gordonsilver.com
 5 BRIGID M. HIGGINS, EQ.
 6 Nevada Bar No. 5990
 7 E-mail: bmh@gordonsilver.com
 8 GREGORY E. GARMAN, ESQ.
 9 Nevada Bar No. 6654
 10 E-mail: geg@gordonsilver.com
 11 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor
 12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89109
 13 Telephone (702) 796-5555
 14 Facsimile (702) 369-2666
 15 [Proposed] Counsel to the Official Committee
 16 of Holders of Executory Contract Rights Through
 17 USA Commercial Mortgage Company

E-Filed On 6/2/06

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

12 In re:
 13 USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE COMPANY,

Case Nos.:
 BK-S-06-10725-LBR
 BK-S-06-10726-LBR
 BK-S-06-10727-LBR
 BK-S-06-10728-LBR
 BK-S-06-10729-LBR

14 Debtor.
 15 In re:
 16 USA CAPITAL REALTY ADVISORS, LLC,

JOINTLY ADMINISTERED
 Chapter 11

17 Debtor.
 18 In re:
 19 USA CAPITAL DIVERSIFIED TRUST DEED FUND, LLC,

**REPLY TO OPPOSITION OF
 THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE
 OF EQUITY SECURITY
 HOLDERS OF USA CAPITAL
 FIRST TRUST DEED FUND,
 LLC AND LIMITED
 OPPOSITION OF DEBTOR TO
 APPLICATION OF THE
 OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF
 HOLDERS OF EXECUTORY
 CONTRACT RIGHTS
 THROUGH USA
 COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE
 COMPANY TO EMPLOY
 GORDON & SILVER, LTD.**

20 Debtor.
 21 In re:
 22 USA SECURITIES, LLC,

23 Debtor.
 24 Affects:
 25 All Debtors
 USA Commercial Mortgage Company
 USA Capital Realty Advisors, LLC
 USA Capital Diversified Trust Deed Fund, LLC
 USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC
 USA Securities, LLC

Date: June 5, 2006
 Time: 9:30 a.m.

1 The Official Committee of Holders of Executory Contract Rights through USA
2 Commercial Mortgage Company (the "Direct Lender Committee") hereby submits its Reply
3 ("Reply") to Opposition of The Official Committee of Equity Security Holders of USA Capital
4 First Trust Deed Fund, LLC (the "First Trust Deed Fund Committee") and the Limited
5 Opposition of Debtors (together the "Oppositions") to the Application Of The Official Committee
6 Of Holders Of Executory Contract Rights Through USA Commercial Mortgage Company To
7 Employ Gordon & Silver, Ltd. ("Application")

8 This Reply is made and based on the Declaration of Gregory E. Garman, Esq. (the
9 "Garman Declaration") in Support of Reply ("Reply") to Opposition of The Official Committee
10 of Equity Security Holders of USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC (the "First Trust Deed
11 Fund Committee") and the Limited Opposition of Debtors (together the "Oppositions") to the
12 Application Of The Official Committee Of Holders Of Executory Contract Rights Through USA
13 Commercial Mortgage Company To Employ Gordon & Silver, Ltd., the points and authorities
14 which follow, the papers and pleadings contained in the Court's file, judicial notice of which is
15 respectfully requested, and any argument of counsel to be entertained at any hearing on this
16 Application.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Opposition, the First Trust Deed Fund Committee objects to the Application of Gordon & Silver, Ltd (“G&S”) based on the following allegations: “(i) due to the Application’s vague disclosures and the failure of G&S to file a statement pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2019(a) (the “2019 Statement”), G&S has not satisfied its burden under section 327(a) of the Bankruptcy Code of showing that it is a disinterested person that does not hold or represent an interest adverse to the Debtors’ estates in the Chapter 11 Cases; and (2) the Application does not contain sufficient information regarding G&S’s compensation.” G&S disagrees with the First Trust Deed Fund Committee’s allegations.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

A. G&S Provided Adequate Disclosures Related to Nevada State Bank.

In the Declaration of Gregory E. Garman filed in support of the Application, G&S disclosed the following:

G&S has an existing relationship with Nevada State Bank. With regard to these bankruptcy proceedings, Nevada State Bank holds an unsecured credit line outstanding to USA Capital Mortgage which is guaranteed by, among others, Thomas Hantges, a former principle [sic] of one or more of the Debtors. Additionally, Nevada State Bank has a depository relationship with one or more of the Debtors.

See Garman Declaration, p. 2, ll. 26-28, p. 3, ll. 1-4.

The First Trust Deed Fund Committee states that this disclosure is inadequate and requests that G&S make "further detailed disclosures regarding the credit line held by Nevada State Bank, G&S's relationship with Nevada State Bank, and how G&S proposes to avoid and/or address any conflict that may arise on account of the foregoing." See Opposition, p. 5, ll. 4-7. The First Trust Deed Fund Committee asserts that because Mr. Hantges is a guarantor on the Nevada State Bank line of credit G&S may have an "irreconcilable conflict of interest." See Opposition, p. 5, ll. 1-4.

As disclosed previously, Nevada State Bank holds an unsecured credit line with USA Capital Mortgage which is guaranteed by Tom Hantges a former principal of one or more of the Debtors. The principal amount of the unsecured credit line is Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000.00).

G&S does not believe that its representation of Nevada State Bank against non-debtor, Mr. Hantges, on his guaranty is adverse to the interests of the Direct Lender Committee as prohibited by 11 U.S.C. §1103(b) which in pertinent part provides:

An attorney . . . employed to represent a committee appointed under section 1102 of this title may not, while employed by such committee, represent any other entity having an adverse interest in connection with the case.

11 U.S.C. §1102(b); see also

The scope of G&S's authority on behalf of the Direct Lender Committee is generally to

1 act to benefit all of the its constituents. In fact, some of the individual Direct Lenders have
 2 guaranties from Mr. Hantges and some do not. Some of the individual Direct Lenders may have
 3 to look to the guaranties for payment, some may not. The Debtors' potential causes of action
 4 against Mr. Hantges, does not create a conflict for G&S with the Direct Lenders' Committee.

5 Moreover, G&S does not believe that its representation of Nevada State Bank provides a
 6 basis for the discretionary denial of compensation under 11 U.S.C. §328(c) and certainly does
 7 not believe such representation creates an "irreconcilable conflict of interest" as alleged by the
 8 First Trust Deed Fund Committee. Ultimately, whether G&S's representation of Nevada State
 9 Bank is adverse to the Direct Lender Committee is a decision for this Court to make.

10 **B. G&S Provided Adequate Disclosure Related to Its Prior Representation of**
Individual Direct Lenders.

11 In the Garman Declaration, G&S disclosed its representation of Janet Buckalew, Trustee
 12 of the Buckalew Trust who is a direct lender and holds equity security interests in one or more
 13 of the funds and of Kevin Higgins who is a direct lender. See Garman Declaration, p. 3, ll. 5-7.
 14 G&S no longer represents the individual interests of Buckalew Trust or Kevin Higgins related to
 15 these proceedings. See Declaration of Gregory Garman In Support of Reply, p. 2, ll. 12-14 .
 16 Moreover, G&S disclosed that prior to the appointment of the Direct Lender Committee, "G&S
 17 was in the process of forming an Ad Hoc Committee of Holders of Direct Lenders. G&S
 18 terminated its efforts to form an Ad Hoc Committee upon the appointment of the Official
 19 Committee and did not at any point accept representation of the Ad Hoc Committee or its
 20 members. If appointed as Committee counsel, G&S will not represent any individual direct
 21 lenders in these proceedings." See Garman Declaration, p. 3, l. 10-14.

22 The First Trust Deed Fund Committee demands that G&S provide more specific
 23 information related to G&S's relationship with the Ad Hoc Committee. The Garman Declaration
 24 made it clear that G&S was never retained by the Ad Hoc Committee. G&S is at a loss for how
 25 it can disclose a representation which never existed. G&S was not paid any compensation from
 26 the Ad Hoc Committee. See Declaration of Gregory Garman in Support of Reply, p. 2, ll. 16.¹
 27

28 ¹ Moreover, counsel for the First Trust Deed Fund Committee, Stutman Treister & Glatt, P.C.

C. G&S is Entitled to Be Compensated For Services Provided to the Direct Lender Committee.

The First Trust Deed Fund Committee and the Debtors argue that pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §330(a)(4)(A)(ii), G&S is only entitled to be compensated from a Debtor's estate for services that are "reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate" and are "necessary to the administration of the case". This is an incorrect reading of 11 U.S.C. §330(a)(4)(A)(ii).

11 U.S.C. §330(a)(1)(A) authorizes the court to award compensation to a professional person under section 1103, among other professionals, for “actual, necessary services rendered by” an attorney employed for such a committee. 11 U.S.C. §330(a)(1). 11 U.S.C. §330(a)(4)(A)(ii) provides, in relevant part, that the court shall not allow compensation for:

(ii) services that were not-

(I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate; or
(II) necessary to the administration of the case.

² 11 U.S.C. §330(a)(4)(A)(ii) (emphasis added).

Both the Debtors and the First Trust Deed Fund Committee argue that under 11 U.S.C. §330(a)(4)(A)(ii), G&S cannot be compensated for advocating positions on behalf of our constituency, the Direct Lender Committee. Specifically, the Debtors and the First Trust Deed Committee argue that G&S cannot be compensated for advocating the Direct Lender Committee's position that the Direct Loans are not property of the Debtors' bankruptcy estates pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §541(a). This argument is illogical, untenable and unsupported by the language of the statute.

11 U.S.C. § 1102(a) authorizes the United States Trustee to appoint committees as deemed

- (continued)

("STG") previously represented and filed pleadings on behalf of "an organized group of investors, who each have done business with one of more of the Debtors" and referred to themselves as the "Interim Committee". See Limited Opposition to the Debtors' Cash Management Motion And Interim Use Of Cash, docket no. 119. STG never identified one individual or entity which it represented even by name. It appears as though STG failed to comply with Bankruptcy Rule 2019. The Court may not have sufficient information to determine whether STG represents adverse interests.

² See also Colliers on Bankruptcy which provides that subsection 330(a)(4) "prohibits compensation for services that are unnecessarily duplicative, unlikely to benefit the debtors' estates, or unnecessary to the administration of the bankruptcy case." Colliers On Bankruptcy, Fifteenth Edition Revised, ¶330.LH[5], p. 330-74 (emphasis added).

1 appropriate. 11 U.S.C. §1102(a). The United States Trustee deemed the appointment of the
 2 Direct Lender Committee appropriate. 11 U.S.C. §1103(a) authorizes a committee to employ
 3 attorneys and other professionals. 11 U.S.C. §1103(c) sets forth a committee's various functions.
 4 In fact, the members of a committee have fiduciary duties to the constituency it represents and
 5 not to the estate as a whole. Woods v. City Nat. Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 312 U.S. 262,
 6 268-69, 61 S.Ct. 493, 497 (1941) (holding under the Act that protective committees are
 7 fiduciaries); Official Unsecured Creditors Committee v. Stern (In re SPM Mfg. Corp.), 984 F.2d
 8 1305, 1315 (1st Cir. 1993). The SPM Mfg. Court held that:

9 The creditors' committee is not merely a conduit through whom the debtor
 10 speaks to and negotiates with creditors generally. On the contrary, it is
 11 purposely intended to represent the necessarily different interests and
 12 concerns of the creditors it represents. It must necessarily be adversarial in
 13 a sense, though its relation with the debtor may be supportive and friendly.
 14 There is simply no other entity established by the Code to guard those
 15 interests. The committee as the sum of its members is not intended to be
 16 merely an arbiter but a partisan which will aid, assist and monitor the
 17 debtor pursuant to its own self interest.

18 SPM Mfg. Corp., 984 F.2d at 1316

19 Courts have determined that ". . . necessary services are those rendered to the committee
 20 in connection with the committee's performance of its functions under 11 U.S.C. §1103(c)." Lifschultz Fast Freight, Inc., 140 B.R. 482, 485 (1992), citing In re Pettibone Corp., 74 B.R.
 21 293, 308 (Bankr. N.D.Ill. 1987); see also In re Thrifty Oil Company, 205 B.R. 1009, 1019
 22 (Bankr. S.D.Ca. 1997). The Lifschultz Court recognized the realities in virtually every chapter
 23 11 bankruptcy case that the interests of the committee may conflict with the interests of the
 24 estate. Lifschultz Fast Freight, Inc., 140 B.R. at 488. As the Lifschultz Court stated:

25 It is illogical to presume that Congress meant to allow the committee's
 26 attorneys compensation only for those services that benefited the estate's
 27 position when Congress expressly authorized the committee to act in the
 28 interest of different entities and further authorized the committee to hire
 lawyers to represent it.

29 Id. (discussing the inherent conflict a limitation on compensation which solely benefited the
 30 estate would have on the counsel for a committee).

31 The compensation of the counsel for the Direct Lender Committee cannot be limited or
 32 prohibited because it is adversarial or contrary to the Debtors' or another committee's position.

1 Such a result would chill the ability of a duly appointed committee to ever retain counsel.

III. CONCLUSION

4 WHEREFORE, Debtor respectfully requests that it be authorized to employ G&S as its
5 attorneys (as of May 26, 2006), to render legal services as described in the Application, with
6 compensation and with reimbursement of expenses to be paid as an administrative expense in
7 such amounts as may be allowed by the Court, pursuant to the provisions of Section 330 of the
Bankruptcy Code.

DATED this 2 day of June, 2006.

GORDON & SILVER, LTD.

By: 
GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.
BRIGID M. HIGGINS, ESQ.
GREGORY E. GARMAN, ESQ.